



# UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE  
United States Patent and Trademark Office  
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS  
P.O. Box 1450  
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450  
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/531,334	08/23/2005	Edeltraud Hagemeister	PAT-01078	7934

26922 7590 06/18/2009

BASF CORPORATION  
Patent Department  
1609 BIDDLE AVENUE  
MAIN BUILDING  
WYANDOTTE, MI 48192

EXAMINER
----------

CHEUNG, WILLIAM K

ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
----------	--------------

1796

NOTIFICATION DATE	DELIVERY MODE
-------------------	---------------

06/18/2009

ELECTRONIC

**Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.**

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

Notice of the Office communication was sent electronically on above-indicated "Notification Date" to the following e-mail address(es):

MARJORIE.ELLIS@BASF.COM  
cdavenport@cantorcolburn.com  
Mgolota@CantorColburn.com

<p align="center"><b>Advisory Action</b> <b>Before the Filing of an Appeal Brief</b></p>	<p><b>Application No.</b> 10/531,334</p>	<p><b>Applicant(s)</b> HAGEMEISTER ET AL.</p>	
	<p><b>Examiner</b> WILLIAM K. CHEUNG</p>	<p><b>Art Unit</b> 1796</p>	

**--The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --**

THE REPLY FILED 03 June 2009 FAILS TO PLACE THIS APPLICATION IN CONDITION FOR ALLOWANCE.

1. ☒ The reply was filed after a final rejection, but prior to or on the same day as filing a Notice of Appeal. To avoid abandonment of this application, applicant must timely file one of the following replies: (1) an amendment, affidavit, or other evidence, which places the application in condition for allowance; (2) a Notice of Appeal (with appeal fee) in compliance with 37 CFR 41.31; or (3) a Request for Continued Examination (RCE) in compliance with 37 CFR 1.114. The reply must be filed within one of the following time periods:

- a) ☒ The period for reply expires 3 months from the mailing date of the final rejection.  
b) ☐ The period for reply expires on: (1) the mailing date of this Advisory Action, or (2) the date set forth in the final rejection, whichever is later. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the mailing date of the final rejection.

Examiner Note: If box 1 is checked, check either box (a) or (b). ONLY CHECK BOX (b) WHEN THE FIRST REPLY WAS FILED WITHIN TWO MONTHS OF THE FINAL REJECTION. See MPEP 706.07(f).

Extensions of time may be obtained under 37 CFR 1.136(a). The date on which the petition under 37 CFR 1.136(a) and the appropriate extension fee have been filed is the date for purposes of determining the period of extension and the corresponding amount of the fee. The appropriate extension fee under 37 CFR 1.17(a) is calculated from: (1) the expiration date of the shortened statutory period for reply originally set in the final Office action; or (2) as set forth in (b) above, if checked. Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of the final rejection, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

#### NOTICE OF APPEAL

2. ☐ The Notice of Appeal was filed on \_\_\_\_\_. A brief in compliance with 37 CFR 41.37 must be filed within two months of the date of filing the Notice of Appeal (37 CFR 41.37(a)), or any extension thereof (37 CFR 41.37(e)), to avoid dismissal of the appeal. Since a Notice of Appeal has been filed, any reply must be filed within the time period set forth in 37 CFR 41.37(a).

#### AMENDMENTS

3. ☐ The proposed amendment(s) filed after a final rejection, but prior to the date of filing a brief, will not be entered because  
(a) ☐ They raise new issues that would require further consideration and/or search (see NOTE below);  
(b) ☐ They raise the issue of new matter (see NOTE below);  
(c) ☐ They are not deemed to place the application in better form for appeal by materially reducing or simplifying the issues for appeal; and/or  
(d) ☐ They present additional claims without canceling a corresponding number of finally rejected claims.

NOTE: \_\_\_\_\_. (See 37 CFR 1.116 and 41.33(a)).

4. ☐ The amendments are not in compliance with 37 CFR 1.121. See attached Notice of Non-Compliant Amendment (PTOL-324).  
5. ☐ Applicant's reply has overcome the following rejection(s): \_\_\_\_\_.  
6. ☐ Newly proposed or amended claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ would be allowable if submitted in a separate, timely filed amendment canceling the non-allowable claim(s).  
7. ☒ For purposes of appeal, the proposed amendment(s): a) ☐ will not be entered, or b) ☐ will be entered and an explanation of how the new or amended claims would be rejected is provided below or appended.  
The status of the claim(s) is (or will be) as follows:  
Claim(s) allowed: none.  
Claim(s) objected to: none.  
Claim(s) rejected: 1-20.  
Claim(s) withdrawn from consideration: none.

#### AFFIDAVIT OR OTHER EVIDENCE

8. ☐ The affidavit or other evidence filed after a final action, but before or on the date of filing a Notice of Appeal will not be entered because applicant failed to provide a showing of good and sufficient reasons why the affidavit or other evidence is necessary and was not earlier presented. See 37 CFR 1.116(e).  
9. ☐ The affidavit or other evidence filed after the date of filing a Notice of Appeal, but prior to the date of filing a brief, will not be entered because the affidavit or other evidence failed to overcome all rejections under appeal and/or appellant fails to provide a showing of a good and sufficient reasons why it is necessary and was not earlier presented. See 37 CFR 41.33(d)(1).  
10. ☐ The affidavit or other evidence is entered. An explanation of the status of the claims after entry is below or attached.

#### REQUEST FOR RECONSIDERATION/OTHER

11. ☒ The request for reconsideration has been considered but does NOT place the application in condition for allowance because:  
See Continuation Sheet.  
12. ☐ Note the attached Information *Disclosure Statement(s)*. (PTO/SB/08) Paper No(s). \_\_\_\_\_.  
13. ☐ Other: \_\_\_\_\_.

/William K Cheung/  
Primary Examiner, Art Unit 1796  
June 12, 2009

Continuation of 11. does NOT place the application in condition for allowance because: In view of the terminal disclaimers filed June 3, 2009, the rejection of Claims 1-19 provisionally on the ground of nonstatutory obviousness-type double patenting as being unpatentable over claims 10-24 of copending Application No. 10/549,624, is withdrawn. Further, the rejection of Claims 1-19 provisionally on the ground of nonstatutory obviousness-type double patenting as being unpatentable over claims 1-11 of copending Application No. 10/486,893, is withdrawn. Regarding the 103 obvious type rejection of claims 1-20, applicants argue that the rejection should be withdrawn since Moritz et al. do not teach all the features, such as the structural recitations being claimed. However, the examiner disagrees because Moritz et al. (col. 13, claim 1) clearly disclose all the basic features as claimed in a claim, Moritz et al. have clearly indicated the criticality of all the basic features in a Taylor reactor for performing a reaction in claim 1. Motivated by the expectation of success of performing a chemical reaction with the Taylor reactor of Moritz et al., it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in art to apply "routine engineering optimization" practices to modify or to adjust the non-essential features of the Taylor reactor of Moritz et al. to obtain the minor variation version of the Moritz et al. to obtain the Taylor reactor as claimed. The rejection is proper under 35 U.S.C. 103(a). Regarding applicants' argument that the specification clearly indicate some of the processig characteristic difference between the apparatus as claimed and the apparatus disclosed in Moritz et al., however, applicants fail to recognize that comments made on the differences between the claimed apparatus and the apparatus of Moritz et al. are not sufficient to be considered comparative data, which are required to demonstrate the criticality of the claimed invention. To be proper, to show criticality of the claimed invention to overcome the 103 rejection set forth, comparative data comprising side by side listing of the conditions and differences in results are required. In view of the reasons set forth above, claims 1-20 remain rejected for the reasons adequately set forth from the office action of April 3, 2009.